Title II of the Higher Education Act
Intuitional Report
APPENDIX C
Annual Institutional Questionnaire on Teacher Preparation:
Academic year: 2000-2001
Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education
Report Year 2: (Fall 2000, Winter, 2001, Summer 2001)

Institution name:	Park University
Respondent name and title:	Dr. Pat Hutchens McClelland, Director of Education
Respondent phone number:	816 584-6727	Fax: 816 741-4371
Electronic mail address:	pmcclelland @mail.park.edu
Address:	8700 NW Riverpark Dr.
City:	Parkville	State: MO	Zip code: 64152

Section I. Pass rates.

Please provide the information in Tables C1 and C2 on the performance of completers of the teacher preparation program in your institution on teacher certification/licensure assessments used by your state.

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing program requirements in the most recent academic year. Thus, for institutional reports due to the state by April 7, 2001, the relevant information is for those completing program requirements in academic year 1999-2000. For purposes of this report, program completers do <u>not</u> include those who have completed an alternative route to certification or licensure as defined by the state.

The assessments to be included are the ones taken by these completers up to 5 years before their completion of program requirements, or up to 3 years afterward. (Please note that in 3 years institutions will report final pass rates that include an update on this cohort of completers; the update will reflect scores reported after the test closure date.) See guide pages 10 and 11.

In cases where a program completer has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test must be used. There must be at least 10 program completers taking the same assessment in an academic year for data on that assessment to be reported; for aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (although not necessarily taking the same assessment) for data to be reported.

Note: The procedures for developing the information required for these tables are explained in the National Center for Education Statistics document entitled *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act*. Terms and phrases in this questionnaire are defined in the glossary, appendix B of the guide.

Section I. Pass rates.

Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Table C-1	*HEA - Title II 2000-2001 Academic Year*	
Institution Name	Park University	
Institution Code	6574	
State	Missouri	
Number of Program Completers Submitted	50	

					Statewide		
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	50						
Type of Assessment	*Assessment Code Number*	*Number Taking Assessment*	*Number Passing Assessment*	*Institutional Pass Rate*	*Number Taking Assessment*	*Number Passing Assessment*	*Statewide Pass Rate*
Professional Knowledge							
Principles of Learning and Teaching (7-12)	524	2			*4*		
Academic Content Areas							
Biology: Content Knowledge, Part 1	231	2			*66*	*65*	*98%*
Early Childhood Education	020	10	9	90%	*281*	*280*	*100%*
Education in the Elementary School	010	1			*4*		
Elem Edu: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	011	23	15	65%	*1615*	*1536*	*95%*
English Lang., Lit. and Comp. : Content Knowledge	041	2			*205*	*197*	*96%*
Mathematics: Content Knowledge	061	1			*105*	*91*	*87%*
MS Science: Content Knowledge	439	2			*22*	*19*	*86%*
MS Social Studies: Content Knowledge	089	1			*17*	*16*	*94%*
Social Studies: Content Knowledge	081	6			*272*	*261*	*96%*
Other Content Areas							
Teaching Special Populations							

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Table C-2	*HEA - Title II 2000-2001 Academic Year*						
Institution Name	Park University						
Institution Code	6574						
State	Missouri						
Number of Program Completers Submitted	50						
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	50				Statewide		
Type of Assessment[2]	*Number Taking Assessment[3]*	*Number Passing Assessment[4]*	*Institutional Pass Rate*	*Number Taking Assessment[3]*	*Number Passing Assessment[4]*	*Statewide Pass Rate*	
Aggregate - Basic Skills							
Aggregate - Professional Knowledge	2			53	53	100%	
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Math, English, Biology, etc.)	48	36	75%	3086	2929	95%	
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health Educations, etc.)				165	164	99%	

Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)				309	307	99%
Aggregate - Performance Assessments						
Summary Totals and Pass Rates[5]	50	38	76%	3612	3452	96%

[1] The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.

[2] Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.

[3] Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.

[4] Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.

[5] Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

Section II. Program information.

A   Number of students in the regular teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation program during academic year 2000-2001, including all areas of specialization.

1.   Total number of students enrolled during 2000-2001: **225**

B   Information about supervised student teaching:

2.   How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 2000-2001? **46**

3.   Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

5 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

0 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

5 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do not include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program. Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 2000-2001: **10**

4.   The student/faculty ratio was (divide the total given in B2. by the number given in B3.): **4.6/1**

5.   The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: **325**hours. The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is **10-12**. The total number of hours required is **325-390** hours.

C   Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

6. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?
   X Yes _____ No
7. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? _____ Yes **X** No
   NOTE: See appendix A of the guide for the legislative language referring to "low-performing" programs.

Section III. Contextual information (optional).

A. Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s).

B. Missouri has asked each institution to include at least the following information.

1. Institution Mission

Park University was established in 1875 committed to "the pursuit of knowledge, to intellectual and social development, and to work and service within a non-sectarian Christian setting." The motto of the university is "Fides et Labor" which reflects our Christian heritage and our tradition of work study in which students have been and are still involved.

Over the years the institution has grown and currently offers traditional liberal arts programs on the home campus in Parkville, but also has an extended learning program which includes Weekend/Evening College, MetroPark program, Internet degree completion, and numerous military sites, plus a Graduate School which currently offers three master's degrees. This represents our commitment to making education available to working adults in many different life situations. We pride ourselves on our diversity.

With our liberal arts vision we attempt to free students from social, cultural and ethical parochialism, encourage integrity and the pursuit of truth. We endeavor to educate our students to be literate-historically, scientifically, aesthetically and ethically, open-minded, and professional. Our goal is to create a distinctive environment of accessibility, sensitivity and excellence. We strive to continually evaluate and explore ways to improve our programs as we attempt to fulfill our mission.

2. Educational Philosophy

The Education Department of Park University is dedicated to educating the finest possible teachers. We recognize the responsibility we have to our students, the community, the profession, American democracy, but most of all to the children of Missouri. We endeavor to stay current and always offer our students best practice principles. Our students start spending time in the school setting in the first course and continue to have field experience throughout their program, culminating in a 10 or 12 week directed teaching experience.

We believe teachers evolve over time and with experience and are on the road from novice to master teacher all of their professional life. It is our role to help them find direction and develop dispositions of a teacher. Students bring motivation to teach and love of children. It is our job to give them the tools with which to become effective teachers. We believe knowledge is not delivered, but is creative and discovered. We use reflective teaching throughout the program in an attempt to build critical thinkers who can challenge their students to become the best they can be. We do believe that teachers touch the future and we are responsible for producing the very best teachers.

3. Conceptual Frameworks

The framework views the development of a teacher as a careerlong, emergent growth process, which can be approached using many of the same principles used to understand the growth and development of children. Vygotsky's (1978) notion of the "Zone of Proximal Development" is central to the framework, along with the notion of "scaffolding". Developing teachers need appropriate scaffolding and social support, which may take on different forms at various points in their development (Huberman, 1989), so that they may achieve at their highest levels of ability.

The scaffolding provided should help developing teachers develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of reflective professionals (Schon, 1983). Such scaffolding may include many elements, including a balance between explicit instruction and guided discovery, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, the use of heuristics and frameworks, and the kinds of activities that facilitate analysis, reflection, creative thinking, and critical thinking. Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) provides an organizing structure for the building of appropriate scaffolding that leads the developing teacher from the simplest levels of thinking to higher order thinking skills.

Higher order thinking skills are important for teachers entering an uncertain profession in uncertain times; the right kind of scaffolding at the right time can make a difference in whether a developing teacher responds to uncertainty in reflective, open-minded ways or in close-minded ways that can hinder their development and lead to "status-quo"-preserving behaviors (Floden & Clark, 1988; Lange & Burroughs-Lange, 1994). Teachers of the twenty-first century will need the ability to deal critically and reflectively with uncertainty in diverse, changing educational settings. They will need the thinking skills necessary to effect transformations within school contexts and within the larger society (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993; Freire, 1970).

Park University's small, close-knit setting, with its small classes and supportive social context, facilitates the kind of scaffolding needed by developing teachers. The program is characterized by close personal relationships, cooperation and collaboration, frequent feedback, and individual conferencing, as well as by field-based components with plenty of support, participation, reflection, and sharing. This kind of effective scaffolding is simultaneously being employed with, and demonstrated to, Park University's developing teachers. The main goal is to help developing teachers, and ultimately the children and young people they teach, to achieve at their highest potentials.

4. Program completers who teach in the private schools and out of state

Private Schools: **0**
Out-of-State: **1**